Social Structure and Forms of Consciousness even Models

By Shomit Sirohi

Introduction

Jewishness just argues for well natured people, Hebrew customs, and labour politics, and feminism. With a love for capital, or money which then is culture as such. Arabic nature is the same – just a process of abstract happiness, in the simple freedoms life with well natured people. Education is about that. Healthcare is about the nature of its happiness. Psychoanalysis is about the complexity of in fact negotiating this shared process. Christian life is about generally Incontinence – something like free life, or rule and life as Hebrew Bible. Such question ignored by economics – which is about the totality therefore of in fact life well lived. It is unlivable to practice economics without these cultural criticism arguments – therefore the base is superstructural and the superstructure expresses more and more the base.

Two points – accumulation of capital, labour as proven by Dialectical Totalisation, and money as culture, with sex and marriage debates.

This process is actually Marx's argument – that structure is in fact complex – culture though is a Jewish question.

I. Historical Structures – how does Accumulation have a History

In fact history is relevant, it is a history to a structure, it becomes that process called the transition from a previous condition of in fact accumulation to a new condition of accumulation which then is also Marx's analysis that in fact there is a historical structure – called historical materialism. It just means this – if we were structuralist. Now in fact the Dialectical Totalisation and Inquiry covers a number of structures of daily life – which then means in intelligible fact that it is also a historical formation in the sense of a number of factors covered as in fact even daily people and series, which then is a cultural factor, but actually labour – it is a theory of labour I propose which then is covering class as in fact a flexible totality – that it is afterall a shifting ensemble of groups, social groups and series. It just means that there is also class, class process, class being, wage, wage-series and this then confirms the process of the existentialist who discovers the true working of class.

II. So therefore two arguments – Historical Structure of Accumulation and in fact Class processes

So in fact there is a history to Marx in simple format covered in many complex intelligible formats – that there is in fact class, class process and class being, and then this confirms class. After that it confirms accumulation of capital which then is the other structure. So it means that Marx is finally an argument of individual, competitive and finally national and international forms of capital with living labour – which makes the general argument – living labour and capital generalized in the world – this then covers it at one level of abstraction which we call also A Critique of Political Economy – he is competing with Moishe Postone – he argues his single level abstraction as it is called – is then in fact just the abstract labour and concrete labour which he thinks is more complex – the question before a political economist then is to cover more details of that process one calls abstract time and temporality even – that there is no question before Postone that there is not just time and abstract time and labour but also in fact temporality. Here he questions in fact also Badiou – that one can in Hegelian idealism therefore model this society into his critique of in fact economics – by just a logical matrix called the transcendental which then is capital afterall but also state. It means while French philosophy is all about formalization in the direction of finally – a matheme, which means a mathematical orientation of the process of just covering a simple objectivity – which Sirohi questions afterall as whether it is not temporality afterall that matters. Closer to Postone therefore as Jewish – he means Spiritual heights about the question of science as in fact ontological – not just ontic. It means that one is free of all the politics, and anti-capitalism if one re-reads Marx – just the process of in fact – labour and capital – ignoring even state and state politics perhaps as democracy – that institution which is so important to the French theorists and is also covered as fundamental to Europe – even what is called institutions like EU, World Bank that I in fact work with ignore the major findings of structure in Postone and Sirohi – that in fact there is something like scientific structure which means in fact – two processes – capital, accumulation and finally labour which then is generally world-wide and is also in fact a model of time and temporality. It is also in fact time that is an independent variable which then is recorded time as what is followed in history which though is also socially necessary labour time – that aggregate which means socially therefore temporality.

III. Now Beyond debates on time, temporality and abstract structuralism – what then is structure – is it just in fact phenomenological as Althusser's blatant misreading of Sirohi argues – that he is Sartrean and so concrete, which he admires.

No in fact he is a thesis on political economy against Lire Le Capital entirely – and that we can formalize society into even Annales without this fact of scientific structure. In fact fully formalized as a rejection of politics unless working class and peasant, and poor. Not this new process of innovating as social protest of a 15 M or something that even Ranciere supports. So the fundamental discovery of Being and Time is being

rejected tout court by the French movement – it is something like the most metaphysical argument on science afterall – that there is also in fact scientific structure in the whole matter of this debate.

IV. Therefore Annales shifted to a Formalism

Formal histories then is enough – that in fact now I am Kantian to Zizek – that in fact accumulation and capital and its history becomes a financial history which then articulates again that there is a accumulation process which then works throughs structures for financial transactions but that is not structure – it is just institutions – structure is in fact capital and labour – that is all – across on a single level of abstraction the whole world – which then is simply re-iterating the relevance of Marx as eternal contribution to science.

Part II – Historical Structure shifted to Empirical Model

I. Accumulation of capital, labour and state institutions which then also means histories which are in fact about just the process of proving capital and labour or class process which then means also abstract structures in fact – which then becomes an empirical structure and model of what is called money, or exchange which then is a critique of Foucault – called power or micro-physics of power – instead of which we should argue about exchange being in fact de-localised system of exchange (money changes hands you fool)

In fact then money changes hands and this is because the structure of capital and labour and its generalization with time, temporality, aggregates – then also means price-series that in fact there are series at the level of money exchange or in fact money is the complex factor of society – if you just live without money – that is unemployment – but in fact money is an essential aspect of every society since in fact the accumulation of capital – proven by historical structure – accumulation and labour – but also by its complex mediations which is called in fact the process of exchange ridden-mediations which means there is two levels then added to exchange – which is exchange money and exchange dynamics which then can be articulated but is structure – that exchange is the real anf formal subsumption into money since history and so it is subsumed. This is a further brilliance of Marx – that subsumption is in fact a process of culture and money.

II. So in fact then Historical Structure (Accumulation, Labour) and in fact (Temporality, aggregate labour) and with it Money as Culture (Culture in Jewish senses is Money and money mediations) which then takes us to the next question Dialectical Totalisation argues for – the intelligible history of Money which is just also Ensembles of Class in Class Struggle

If there is capital, labour and temporality – then there is class and class action for wages. Which then is also the process called abstraction. What Hallward understands is that this is in fact a class process and lived process which is being abstracted from though to produce abstract labour.

The full process of Marx then – the proof of structure – afterall and only that –

I. Accumulation
II. Labour
III. History as process
IV. Complex money or exchange mediations
V. Use-value mediations
VI. Natural mediations.

Part III

I. Metabolism – Social, Natural and Ecological Metabolism therefore

And so Marx is further scientific – that there is complex biology at work as well – what is called ecological living processes which means from natural life comes the alienation from nature which then produces historical structures which then produces complex labouring patterns which then are natural patterns and ecological patterns which though is what we are alienated from – and that then is going back to nature but as modern capitalism.

Part IV.

I. Critique of Political Economy also Critique of Ideology (Sive as it were)

So when one criticizes the object and produces a conceptual object – it better be complex. It has to be a complex structure – which then is simple structure as well – it means society is a model and is a complex model which though is lived and phenomenological therefore. It is just the nature of structure to be proven by a critique – that ideology is more and more about accumulation against the poor, which though is historical accumulation or even capital itself – which then is also a necessary moment of capital – but the process is ideological because there is a surplus-value which though requires labouring, poverty all of that – which creates a vampire called far rights – let us say then – that the problem of economics is in fact simple – to be in fact a critic of culture and money. Where do I get my bank account, how do I get a scholarship – who is Hebrew to talk to. Therefore culture, class and money that is Jewish and even Arabic. And what then is feminism, can there be sex and marriage debates in this society where in fact low culture is so common in Europe – how do I live an ecological life without Situationism – does it make sense. What Hegel calls, our alienation from each other. What Marx says is money and Hebrew nature, with questions – like can we imagine that women are labouring bodies when they should be sexual politics.